DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 149 611 FL 009 195

AUTHOR Hamalainen, Eila
TITLE The Copula and Subject Complement Construction in English and Its Equivalents in Finnish. Contrastive Papers: Jyvaskyla Contrastive Studies, 4. Reports from the Department of English, No. 4.
INSTITUTION Jyvaskyla Univ. (Finland). Dept. of English.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 19p.
AVAILABLE FROM Department of English, University of Jyvaskyla, 40100 Jyvaskyla 10, Finland

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case (Grammar); *Contrastive Linguistics; Descriptive Linguistics; Determiners (Languages); *Finnish; Finno Ugric Languages; Form Classes (Languages); Grammar; Language Patterns; Linguistic Theory; Nominals; Phrase Structure; *Sentence Structure; *Structural Analysis; *Surface Structure; Translation; Verbs

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses subject-verb-complement (SVC) clauses and their renderings in English and Finnish. Comparisons are made on the level of surface structure and with regard to equivalence in the sense of one construction being an optimum translation of the other. The definition of congruence, i.e., formal similarity and equal number of equivalent formatives arranged in similar order, excluding the English article, is applied to these equivalents. This reveals a certain amount of congruence on the sentence level. The congruent sentence types are those that have "be - olla" plus a noun phrase (NP) subject complement in the singular or in the plural and those with "be - olla" plus adjectival subject complement in the singular. The other copulas in Finnish require a particular case for the subject complement; thus, the sentences are not formally similar and not congruent with the English sentences. This is also the case with "be - olla" plus NP in the plural or adjectival complement in the plural. (Author/AM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Lehtonen; K. Sajavaara

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED149611

THE COPULA AND SUBJECT COMPLEMENT CONSTRUCTION IN ENGLISH AND ITS EQUIVALENTS IN FINNISH

EILA HOOGLXINEN
University of Jyväskylä

Sentences (1) to (4) are examples of SVC clauses. These are the clause types that will be dealt with in this paper.

(1) Mary is *a nurse*.
Mary *on sairaanhoitaja*.

(2) The girl *is very pretty*.
Tyttö *on hyvin sievä*.

(3) He *became a doctor*.
Hänestä *tuli lääkäri*.

(4) They *seem nervous*.
He *näyttävät hermostuneilta*.

The sentences are dealt with on the level of the surface structure and with regard to equivalence in the sense it is defined by Marton (1968: 54-55) and Krzeszowski (1971:38), i.e. two constructions can be regarded as equivalent when one is an optimal translation of the other.[1]

DESCRIPTION OF THE COPULA AND SUBJECT COMPLEMENT

The copula is an empty link between the subject (S) of the sentence and the subject complement (C). It connects a nominal and an adjectival or two nominals, i.e. it is found in the frame *The man ----- old/a pilot* (Christophersen-Sandved 1969:144). The subject complement can also be a clause, but only the types in sentences (1) to (4) will be dealt with here. The principal copula is *be* 'olla'. It has the widest range of occurrence as regards the complements. Another important copula is *become* 'tulla

[1] The examples for this paper have been collected from two novels by Agatha Christie: *A Carribbean Mystery* (London, 1974) and its translation *Lomahotellin murhat* (Porvoo, 1966) by Anna-Liisa Laine and *A Pocket Full of Rye* (London, Glasgow, 1971) translated as *Salaperäiset rukiinjyvät* (Porvoo, 1956) by Eila Pennanen; and from *Lord of the Flies* (London, 1968) by William Golding and its translation *Kärpästen Herra* (Keuruu, 1960) by Juhana Perkki. In addition, some of the examples have been taken from grammar books and some other studies on the same subject and some have been produced by the writer.

FL009195

joksikin'. In accordance with the function of these two important verbs, the copulas can be divided into 'current' and 'resulting' (Quirk et al. 1972:820-821). The English copulas which are dealt with in this paper are listed in Table 1 with their Finnish equivalents.

current			resulting
I		II	
be	olla		become, get, grow, go, come, fall, run, turn — tulla joksikin, muuttua
feel	tuntea, tuntua		
look	näyttää		
sound	kuulostaa		
smell	haista, tuoksua		
taste	maistua		
seem, appear	näyttää, vaikuttaa		
prove	osoittautua		
		remain, stay, keep, continue — jäädä, pysyä	

Table 1. The English current and resulting copulas with their Finnish equivalents.

In SVC sentences the subject and the subject complement are in an intensive or co-referential relation to each other (Quirk et al. 1972: 820). The subject complement is a kind of attribute to the subject and the copulas can be grouped accordingly as shown in Table 1. The current copulas can be divided into two subgroups, the first of which, in addition to *be* 'olla', includes the verbs of perception expressing the attribution in the SVC sentence as related to one of the senses. The verbs *seem, appear* 'näyttää' and *prove* 'osoittautua' express the attribution with regard to its facticity. The second group of current copulas expresses the duration or continuity of the attribution stated. The resulting copulas are verbs which express a change in the state of attribution. The subject complement is the result of the change (Bald 1972:61-106). The subject complement, then, is an adjective or a noun phrase which can be considered a modifier to the subject, eg. *She is*

beautiful 'Hän on kaunis' or *He is a singer* 'Hän on laulaja'. In clauses with the copula be 'olla', however, the NP subject complement can also be identified with the subject, eg. *That actor is Mr Johnson* 'Tuo näyttelijä on herra Johnson'. These clauses are called equative, whereas those in which the subject complement is an attribute are called attributive (Halliday 1968:190). The adjective as subject complement has only one form in English while in Finnish the adjective has number concord with the subject. The NP subject complement has number concord with the subject in both languages. Consider examples (5a,b) and (6a,b).

(5a) The woman *is old.*
Nainen *on vanha.*
(nom.sg.) (nom.sg.)

(5b) The women *are old.*
Naiset *ovat vanhoja.*
(nom.pl.) (part.pl.)

(6a) The child *is an angel.*
Lapsi *on enkeli.*
(nom.sg.) (nom.sg.)

(6b) The children *are angels.*
Lapset *ovat enkeleitä.*
(nom.pl.) (part.pl.)

With an NP subject complement, English normally requires the indefinite article (sometimes definite), which has no formal equivalent in Finnish. The leaving out of the article is in English, as for instance in *turn* + NP or *become* + NP, is not reflected in the Finnish construction.

(7a) He *turned traitor.*
Hänestä *tuli petturi.*

(7b) He *became a traitor.*
Hänestä *tuli petturi.*
'From him became traitor'.

In Finnish grammars (Setälä 1973, Siro 1964, Penttilä 1963) the subject complement is dealt with under two categories: the predicate complement and predicate adverbial. The different terms used for the elements in a similar function in a SVC clause result from the difference in their form. The case of the predicate complement is said to be the nominative or partitive (Setälä et al. 1972:79). These two cases occur with the principal copulas *olla* 'be' and *tulla* 'become' and thus the subject complement is called the predicate complement. If the subject complement is in some other case, it is referred to as the predicate adverbial. This is the

case with all the other copulas - and sometimes with *olla* and *tulla*, as well - because the verbs require a specific case for the complement. Since a certain case is the only one that is acceptable in connection with the other copulas (eg. *pysyä* 'remain' always requires the essive), the distinction between the predicate complement and predicate adverbial is only formal and misleading.

In connection with *olla* 'be' and *tulla* 'become' the difference between the 'predicate complement' and 'predicate adverbial' forms is not only formal but also implies a difference in meaning. Consider examples (9a, 9b) and (10a, 10b).

(9a) Hän *on opettaja*.
(nom.sg.)
He *is a teacher*.

(9b) Hän *on opettajana*.
(essive sg.)
He is working as a teacher.

(10a) Hänestä *tuli opettaja*.
(elative sg.)
He *became a teacher*.

(10b) Hän *tuli opettajaksi*.
(translative sg.)
He came here to work as a teacher.

When the essive form is used with *olla* 'be' and the translative form with *tulla* 'become', there is usually an implication of an aspectual constraint. Example (9a) means the same as the English formal equivalent. It gives the information that the person in question is a teacher by profession. (9b), on the other hand, has an aspectual implication. The essive form *opettajana* means that the person is not necessarily a teacher but that he works as one somewhere or for the time being. The use of the Finnish essive is expressed in English by the *-ing* form of the verb *work* or *act*. The same difference occurs with *tulla* 'become' in sentences (10a) and (10b). (10a) is the usual form for expressing that somebody is, for instance, trained for a certain profession. In (10b) the implication is again that he may not be a teacher but has come here to work as one. The verb *tulla* here has the meaning 'come'.

The partitive and translative forms are also found with an adjectival subject complement in connection with the copula *tulla* 'become':

(11a) Puuro *tuli mustaa*.
Porridge *was made black*.

(11b) Puurosta *tuli mustaa.*
(part.sg.)
+Out of porridge became black.

(11c) Puuro *tuli mustaksi.*
(translative sg.)
Porridge became black.

In examples (11a - c) *tulla* - either 'come' or 'become' - can only mean 'become' because of the quality of the subject. (11a) and (11b) both have the same meaning: 'porridge was made and it became black', whereas (11c) implies that the porridge was something else first and then turned black. These types of sentences are clearly dependent on the quality of the subject since all three forms are not acceptable in every case. Consider the following examples.

(12a) +Lumi *tuli mustaa.*

(12b) +Lumesta *tuli mustaa.*

(12c) Lumi *tuli mustaksi.*
Snow *became black.*

Lumi 'snow' is something that exists and cannot be made and thus only the form used in (12c) is acceptable. It has the meaning that 'there was snow and for some reason it turned black'.

BE + C VS. *OLLA* + C

The English SVC clause is mostly translated by a SVC clause into Finnish. Thus there is a relation of formal correspondence in most cases. As regards the copula *be* 'olla', the construction NP + *be* + adjectival/NP usually has the congruent structure NP + *olla* + adjectival/NP in Finnish. The only differences are the article with NP's in English and the number concord between the adjectival complement and the subject in Finnish. Consider examples (13 - 16).

(13) I'm very *healthy.*
Olen hyvin *terve.*

(14) *Are* you *a doctor?*
Oletteko lääkäri?

(15) He might *have been seventy* or *eighty*, or even *ninety.*
Hän olisi voinut *olla seitsemän-, kahdeksan-* tai vaikka *yhdeksänkymmenen.*

(16) It was very seldom that Molly Kendal *was out of temper.*
Molly Kendal *oli* harvoin *pahalla tuulella.*

Examples (13 - 16) show that the parts of speech correspond to each other in English and Finnish as subject complements, and when the subject complement is realised by a prepositional phrase it is usually translated by the corresponding noun phrase in a local case. Some individual expressions break the basic SVC congruence between English and Finnish. Consider examples (17 - 20).

(17) I'm *cold*.
Minulla *on kylmä*.

(18) They are very *warm*.
Heillä *on* kovin *lämmin*.

(19) She's *asleep*, isn't she?
Hän *nukkuu*, eikö niin?

(20) He *is fond of* us.
Hän *pitää* meistä.

Examples (17) and (18) are instances of an English expression with the copula *be* 'olla', whereas in Finnish the construction is SVO with the verb *olla* 'have, own' and not the copula *olla* 'be'. The structure in Finnish is the same as in *Meillä on auto* 'We have (got) a car' (literally: 'On us is car'). Another instance of a difference between the two languages is presented in examples (19) and (20). An English *a*-adjective construction is normally translated into Finnish by using the corresponding intransitive or transitive verb, as *nukkua* 'sleep' in (19) and *pitää* 'like' in (20) show, and the clause structure is then SV or SVO.

In connection with the copula *be* 'olla' the subject complement can also be in the genitive, and in these cases there are both differences and similarities between English and Finnish. If the genitive subject complement is a possessive pronoun or the genitive of a name, then correspondence is complete.

(21) The car *is mine*.
Auto *on minun*.

(22) The house *is Henry's*.
Talo *on Henryn*.

The differences occur when the subject complement is the genitive of an ordinary noun. Both English and Finnish use the verbs *own* 'omistaa' and *belong to* 'kuulua jollekulle', and the SVO and SVA clause patterns respectively when the construction with *be* 'olla' + C in the genitive is not acceptable. Consider examples (23a, 23b).

(23a) ?+The book *is my daughter's*.
+Kirja *on tyttäreni*.
Se on *tyttäreni* kirja.
or Kirja *kuuluu* tyttärelleni. (SVA)
Tyttäreni *omistaa* kirjan. (SVO)

(23b) +The book *is the daughter's*.
Kirja *on tyttären*.
The book *belongs to* the daughter.
The daughter *owns* the book.

The examples above illustrate the use of the genitive subject complement in the two languages. (23a) shows that be + C in the genitive is possible in English when there is a possessive pronoun in front of the genitive. In this case Finnish uses the genitive attribute construction or the translations with *kuulua* 'belong' or *omistaa* 'own', since the sentence +*Kirja on tyttäreni* is confused with the identification predicative of the type *Hän on tyttäreni* 'She is my daughter'. On the other hand, when the possessive pronoun is replaced by the definite article, the SVC pattern is not acceptable in English but can be used in Finnish. The sentence *Kirja on tyttären* is not, however, quite natural by itself, since it seems to imply some kind of continuation to the sentence. In any case, in English the verbs *own* 'omistaa' and *belong to* 'kuulua jollekulle' are used.

In Finnish the construction with the genitive subject complement is possible with an inanimate noun as a subject in some cases, whereas the verbs *own* or *belong to* must be used in English.

(24) Tämä metsä *on valtion*.
+This forest *is the state's*.
This forest *belongs to* the state.
The state *owns* this forest.

The acceptability of (24) in Finnish, too, depends on the quality of the noun in the genitive. Nouns which can be thought of as some kind of collective bodies can be used here, eg. *valtio* 'state', *kunta* 'commune', *yliopisto* 'university', etc. Thus, examples like (25a) are not acceptable in either language.

(25a) +Vesi *on järven*.
+The water *is the lake's*.

The paraphrase with *own* 'omistaa' cannot be used in these cases either.

(25b) +Järvi *omistaa* veden.
+The lake *owns* the water.

When English has the *of*-genitive construction in the C position, Finnish uses the subject complement in the partitive (26) or the attributive construction (27).

(26) The knife is *of steel*.
Veitsi on *terästä*.

(27) He is *a man of wisdom*.
Hän on *viisas mies*.
'wise man'.

The sentence pattern is SVC in both languages. The English SVC clauses with *be* + NP subject complement can be divided into attributive and equative clauses in which the two meanings of *be* 'be a member of' and 'be identical with' occur respectively (Halliday 1968:190-202).

(28a) Percival's wife is *a hospital nurse*.
Percivalin vaimo on *sairaanhoitaja*.

(29a) Percival Fortescue is *the residuary legatee*.
Percival Fortescue on *pääperillinen*.

(28a) is an attributive clause where the subject is the attribuant and the complement the attribute (Halliday 1968:190); the complement classifies the subject and clauses of this kind cannot be reversed in English.

(28b) **A hospital nurse* is Percival's wife,...
?Sairaanhoitaja on Percivalin vaimo,...

In equative clauses the definite article is used with the subject complement is identified with the subject (Quirk 1973:353). The roles of the subject and the complement are those of 'identifier' and 'identified' and, according to Halliday (1968:190), either of the elements may come first in the sentence. Thus, sentence (29a) is reversible in English,

(29b) *The residuary legatee* is Percival Fortescue.
Pääperillinen on Percival Fortescue.

In Finnish there is no formal difference between sentences (28b) and (29b) since definiteness is not marked with articles; both the attributive and equative clauses can in principle be reversed. However, if a Finnish sentence like (28b) is translated into English it will be of the equative type, i.e. *The hospital nurse is Percival's wife*,... This shows that when an attributive clause is reversed it actually becomes equative, i.e. an identification predicative. Thus, the Finnish and English sentences in (28b) are not translative equivalents. In cases of

identification predicative it is often difficult to decide which of the nominals in the sentence is the subject and which the subject complement (Jespersen 1954:8).

(30a) Brown was *the thief*.
Brown oli *varas*.

(30b) The thief was Brown.
Varas oli Brown.

Finnish grammarians have made several questions for how to solve this problem (Numminen 1959, Koski 1969, Ikola 1973). Various formal ways of solving the problem have been presented but there always remains something that has to be defined on a semantic basis. Thus, according to Hakulinen (1975:90), when it is difficult to define the grammatical functions of the nominal members in the SVC sentence, the context must be taken into account. Otherwise the sentences cannot be properly understood.

VERBS OF PERCEPTION + C

The SVC clause type is attributive in connection with copulas other than *be*. Among the verbs of perception, *feel* has two copula uses, which in Finnish are expressed by two verbs *tuntea* and *tuntua*. When *feel* is used in the sense 'have a feeling' the Finnish equivalent is *tuntea itsensä* ('feel oneself') or *tuntea olevansa/olonsa* ('feel oneself to be') plus the subject complement in the translative.

(31) She *felt old* and *tired* and *worried*.
Hän *tunsi itsensä vanhaksi, väsyneeksi* ja *huolestuneeksi*.

(32) She'd never *felt better*.
Hän ei ollut koskaan *tuntenut olonaan paremmaksi*.

In sentences like (31) and (32) the Finnish *tuntea* requires the reflexive *itsensä* 'oneself' or the form *olonsa* 'one's feeling' (verbal noun derived from the verb *olla* + possessive suffix) or *olevansa* (an abridged form for *että hän oli* 'that he was'), whereas the reflexive pronoun is not allowed after *feel* in English. *Feel* 'tuntea' can sometimes be translated by *olla* 'be' or *voida* 'feel (better)'.

(33) I *feel* so *nervous*, you know...
Olen niin *hermostunut*, että...

(34) He *feels* much *better* today.
Hän *voi* paljon *paremmin* tänään.

With the noun phrase complement, *feel* accepts only a few nouns in a *feel* +

NP structure, such as *fool* 'narri', *idiot* 'idiootti' etc., and with other nouns which have no evaluative function the construction is *feel* + *like* + NP.

(35) He *felt a fool/an idiot.*
Hän *tunsi itsensä narriksi/idiootiksi.*

(36) She *felt like a teacher.*
Hän *tunsi itsensä opettajaksi.*

The Finnish construction for both of these is *tuntea itsensä/olevansa* + NP.

Feel in the sense of *tuntua* can only take an adjectival complement and it occurs in a similar construction to the copulas *look* 'näyttää' and *sound* 'kuulostaa' with an adjectival subject complement.

(37) The table *feels* rough.
Pöytä *tuntuu* karealta.

(38) Ellen *looked doubtful.*
Ellen *näytti* epäilevältä.

(39) That was why the place *looked* so *different.*
Siksi kokouspaikka *näytti* niin *oudolta.*

(40) Mrs Percival *sounded* slightly *out of breath.*
Rouva Percival *kuulosti* hiukan *hengästyneeltä.*

(41) I suppose that man thought Fortescue *sounded better.*
Tämä mies taisi arvella Fortescuen *kuulostavan paremmalta.*

The Finnish translations for *feel/look/sound* + adjective are *tuntua/näyttää/kuulostaa* + adjective in the ablative or allative. In connection with the NP subject complement the verbs *look* and *sound* behave in a similar manner to *feel* 'tuntea'. They occur in constructions S + *look/sound* + NP with nouns which can be said to have evaluative function (*fool, idiot*) and also with NP's when the evaluative function is implicated by a modifying adjective. Consider example (42):

(42) He *looked/sounded an efficient teacher.*
Hän *näytti/kuulosti pätevältä opettajalta.*

With nouns like *teacher* 'opettaja' they require the *like*-construction. The Finnish equivalent is *näyttää/kuulostaa* + NP in the ablative in both cases.

(43) He *looks/sounds like a teacher.*
Hän *näyttää/kuulostaa opettajalta/opettajamaiselta.*

The last two verbs of perception, *taste* 'maistua' and *smell* 'haista, tuoksua', also take an adjectival complement; in the Finnish construction

the subject complement is in the ablative or allative.

(44) The coffee *tastes bitter*.
Kahvi *maistuu kitkeältä* (-lle).

(45) Your perfume *smells lovely*.
Hajuvetesi *tuoksuu ihanalle*.

(46) It *smells* really *bad*.
Se *haisee* todella *pahalle*.

Examples (45) and (46) show that Finnish uses two different verbs for *smell*, i.e. *haista* and *tuoksua*. Thus, Finnish differentiates between the quality of smell in the verb, which in English is shown only by the complement. In Finnish *haista* is either neutral or used for a bad, unpleasant smell, and *tuoksua* is used for a good, pleasant smell only. With a noun phrase complement the verbs *smell* and *taste* always require a construction with *like* or *of*.

(47) It *tastes of caviar*.
Se *maistuu kaviaarilta*.

(48) This drink *tastes like whisky*.
Tämä juoma *maistuu viskille* (-ltä).

(49) Your breath *smells of brandy*.
Henkesi *haisee konjakille*.

(50) That *smells like oil*.
Tuo *haisee öljylle*.

The Finnish construction for both *taste/smell* + *like* or *of* + NP is the same *maistua/haista, tuoksua* + NP in the ablative or allative case in the same way as in the adjectival construction. According to Bald (1973:53-54), in English a difference is made between the substance really being or not being what is denoted by the subject complement by using *like* and *of* respectively. This difference cannot be recognized in Finnish since the ablative and allative forms seem to occur interchangeably.

SEEM, APPEAR + C VS. *NÄYTTÄÄ, VAIKUTTAA* + C

As regards the copulas *seem, appear* 'näyttää, vaikuttaa', the correspondence between the English and Finnish SVC clause pattern seems to be fairly complete. *Seem, appear* + adjective/NP has *näyttää, vaikuttaa* (or *tuntua*) + adjective/NP in the ablative case as its Finnish equivalent.

(51) She *appeared* quite *bewildered*.
Hän *näytti* täysin *hämmentyneeltä*.

(52) It *seered* so *unfair*, so *cruel*.
Se *tuntui* niin *epäoikeudenmukaiselta*, niin *julmalta*.

(53) The Hillingdons *seem* very *pleasant*.
Hillingdonit *vaikuttavat* erittäin *miellyttäviltä ihmisiltä*.

(54) Mr Jackson *seems a very obliging young man*.
Herra Jackson *näyttää hyvin* nöyrältä ja *tottelevaiselta nuorelta mieheltä*.

The copula *to be* 'ol'a' is often inserted in the sentence with *seem* or *appear* and it also occurs in the Finnish equivalent, even though it is sometimes not used in English. The Finnish equivalent is *näyttää/tuntua olevan* + the complement.

(55) You *seem to be* very *knowledgeable* on the subject.
Näytätte olevan hyvin *perehtynyt* kosmetiikkaan.

(56) It *seems to be true*, though.
Se *näyttää* kuitenkin *olevan totta*.

(57) Young fellow *seemed devoted* to her.
Nuori mies *näytti olevan kiintynyt* häneen.

The insertion of *to be* makes the use of the specified, identifiable reference possible with the NP complement.

(58) You *seem to be the leader*.
Näytät olevan johtaja.

PROVE + C VS. *OSOITTAUTUA* + C

The copula *prove*, which relates to an attribution that has been found true, as opposed to that expressed by *seem*, *appear* which may be doubted, has *osoittautua* as its Finnish equivalent.

(59) The old man *proved seventy years old*.
Vanhus *osoittautui seitsemänkymmenvuotiaaksi*.

(60) The story *proved true*.
Kertomus *osoittautui todeksi*.

(61) Ellen *proved to be grim* but *unafraid*.
Ellen *osoittautui tuikeaksi* mutta *pelottomaksi*.

Again the correspondence of the SVC clause pattern between English and Finnish is complete: *prove* + adjective/NP is translated by *osoittautua* + adjective/NP in the translative. In English a reflexive pronoun can occur in the SVC clause but in Finnish it is implied by the reflexive verb *osoittautua* ('prove oneself' as against *osoittaa* 'prove'). Consider example (62).

(62) The new typist *proved useless*.
The new typist *proved herself* (to be) *useless*.
Uusi konekirjoittaja *osoittautui hyödyttömäksi*.

REMAIN + C VS. PYSYÄ, JÄÄDÄ + C

Another subgroup among the current copulas consists of the verbs which express the continuation of the attribution, i.e. *remain* 'jäädä, pysyä', and its synonyms *keep*, *stay* and *continue*. The feature [+ duration] characterizes the copulas of this class (Bald 1972:89). In Finnish, *jäädä* requires the subject complement in the translative case and *pysyä* in the essive case. *Remain* + adjective/NP corresponds to Finnish *pysyä*, *jäädä* + adjective/NP. Consider examples (63) - (66).

(63) Ralph wiped the salt water off his lips and tried again, but the shell *remained silent*.
Ralph pyyhkäisi suolavettä huuliltaan ja yritti uudelleen, mutta simpukka *pysyi mykkänä*.

(64) Normally Lance would have smiled at this, but long dark face *remained serious*.
Tavallisesti Lance olisi hymyillyt tälle, mutta nyt hänen pitkät tummat kasvonsa *jäivät vakaviksi*.

(65) He *remained a teacher*.
Hän *pysyi opettajana*.

(66) She *remained a true friend*.
Hän *pysyi tosi ystävänä*.

The synonyms of *remain* occur mainly with an adjectival subject complement and have *pysyä* + adjective as their Finnish equivalent.

(67) The coffee *kept warm*.
Kahvi *pysyi lämpimänä*.

(68) The weather will *stay cold* for several days.
Sää *pysyy kylmänä* useita päiviä.

(69) She *kept* quite *calm*.
Hän *pysyi* aivan *rauhallisena*.

(70) He *continues obstinate*.
Hän *pysyy* (jatkuvasti) *itsepäisenä*.

In Finnish an adverbial is sometimes added in the SVC clause in order to emphasize the continuity or duration of the attribution. This is done especially with the verb *continue* (example 70), which is often translated by *olla* + an adverbial + the subject complement (example 71).

(71) They *continued good friends*.
He *olivat edelleen hyviä ystäviä*.
He *pysyivät edelleen hyvinä ystävinä*.

The Finnish verb *jäädä* 'remain' occurs as an equivalent of *go* + *un-* + participle, a construction which also belongs to the *remain*-group semantically. In this case the Finnish form in the SVC pattern is *jäädä* + the third infinitive abessive.

(72) The crime *went unpunished*.
Rikos *jäi rankaisematta*.

(73) The door *went unpainted*.
Ovi *jäi maalaamatta*.

Remain can also be used with a negated participle and the subject has the feature [+ duration], as opposed to [- duration], which occurs with *go*.

(74a) Her gesture *remained disregarded*.

(74b) Her gesture *went disregarded*.
Hänen eleensä *jäi huomaamatta*.

This semantic difference is not made in the verb in Finnish, but *jäädä* is used in both cases.

RESULTING COPULAS

The principal copula among the resulting copulas is *become* 'tulla joksikin'. *Become* occurs both with an adjectival and a nominal subject complement without restrictions. The use of its synonyms *get*, *come*, *go*, *grow*, *turn*, *fall* and *run* is more restricted. The Finnish equivalent for the resulting copulas is generally *tulla* or *muuttua* + complement in the translative. Another verb which is commonly used is *käydä* + complement in the translative. The construction elative + *tulla* + nominative is also used as in (78).

(75) Inspector Neele's face *became blank*.
Tarkastaja Neelen kasvot *muuttuivat ilmeettömiksi*.

(76) The movement *became regular* while the chant lost its first superficial excitement and...
Kiertoliike *kävi säännölliseksi* laulun menettäessä hillittömän hurjuutensa ja...

(77) And in the end, as you say, like Smith and the Brides in the Bath, it *becomes a habit*.
Ja lopulta, kuten tuolle Smithille kävi, *siitä tulee tapa*.

(78) It was very long business nursing her and we *became great friends*.
Hänen hoitamisensa oli hyvin pitkällinen juttu ja *meistä tuli hyvät ystävät*.

(79) Only she's *getting* very *peculiar*.
Hän on vain *tulossa* kovin *omituiseksi*.

Tulla, muuttua, käydä all take the adjectival subject compelement in the translative and *become* + NP has *tulla* + NP as its equivalent. The NP is in the nominative (77 - 78). An interesting difference between English and Finnish regarding the resulting copulas is that *become, get, go, grow, come, fall, turn, run* + an adjectival subject complement is very often realized in a reflexive verb in Finnish, eg. *become (grow) old* 'vanhentua', *fall ill* 'sairastua', *turn yellow* 'kellastua', *run dry* 'kuivua', *get angry* 'vihastua', *come open* 'avautua', etc. Thus, with an adjectival subject complement, the English SVC pattern often corresponds to an SV pattern in Finnish where the V element includes the meaning of *become* + adjective. There are several adjectives with which the verb *tulla* or *muuttua* + adjective can be used but the reflexive verb is preferred.

(80) He has *become (grown) old.*
Hän on { *vanhentunut.* / *tullut vanhaksi.* }

(81) The leaves have *turned yellow.*
Lehdet ovat *kellastuneet.*

On the other hand, in some cases the reflexive verb and *tulla* + adjective construction is regarded as unacceptable, eg. *rich* 'rikas', *poor* 'köyhä'.

(82) They have *become rich.*
He ovat { *rikastuneet. / *tulleet rikkaiksi.* }

The construction *become (get)* + participle is also normally translated with the corresponding reflexive verb.

(83) Miss Marple immediately *became flustered.*
Neiti Marple *hämmentyi* heti.

(84) You can *get tired* of birds and butterflies.
Ihminen voi *väsyä* lintuihin ja perhosiin.

(85) ...so I've *got interested* in this business.
..., joten olen *kiinnostunut* tästä jutusta.

In most cases, *tulla* is an unmarked verb; several descriptive verbs are used as marked variants for it.

(86) The air moved a little faster and *became a light wind,...*
Ilmavirta *vahvistui* heikoksi tuuleksi,...
('Ilma liikkui nopeammin ja *tuli kevyeksi* tuuleksi').

(87) His face *got very red* and he shoved back the snapshot...
Hänen kasvonsa *karahtivat punaisiksi* ja hän työnsi kuvan...

(88) Ralph *went crimson.*
Ralph *lehahti punaiseksi.*

(89) Jack's face *went* so *white* that the freckles showed as clear, brown flecks.
Jackin kasvot *valahtivat* niin *kalpeiksi*, että pisamat näkyivät selvinä ruskeina läikkinä.

These verbs express the rate of the change and verbs such as *karahtaa, lehahtaa, valahtaa* are specific to these contexts and the particular adjectives of colour. In English *become* is neutral with regard to the type of change, *grow* is used for gradual change and *go* for quick change (Poutsma 1928:26). This difference is not made in Finnish if verbs like *tulla, muuttua, rikastua*, etc. are used, but the use of verbs like *valahtaa, karahtaa* implies the rate of change. The copula *grow* is also used with *to be* and there is a semantic distinction of permanence and temporary change between *grow to be* and *grow* respectively (Bald 1972:100-101). In Finnish this is expressed by the form of the subject word.

(90) He *grew to be tall*.
Hänestä *tuli kookas*.('Out of him became tall').

(91) He *grew angry*.
Hän *tuli vihaiseksi*.

In addition to the rapidity of change, some of the English copulas also imply a change for the worse, eg. *go, turn, run*.

(92) Your man's *gone mad, stark staring mad*, that's what's the matter.
Teidän miehenne on *tullut hulluksi*, aivan *pähkähulluksi*.

(93) The milk has *turned sour*.
Maito on *hapantunut*.

(94) The well has *run dry*.
Kaivo on *kuivunut*.

In Finnish, the same expressions are used for the changes in both directions. The Finnish equivalent for the verbs of the *become* class in connection with a noun complement is *tulla* + NP. In addition to the SVC clause pattern and the SV pattern, other constructions are used in Finnish for *become, get, grow* + complement. This is the case with *become* + negated adjectives as against a Finnish transitive verb in the negative (example 95).

(95) Simon *became inarticulate* in his effort to express mankind's essential illness...
Simon *ei löytänyt oikeita sanoja* yrittäessään ilmentää ihmisen sisintä jäytävää sairautta.

The clause pattern here is SVO in Finnish. Expressions like *tulla sanattomaksi* could be used but they often sound clumsy. In English, the verbs *get, grow* and *fall* are often used in the progressive form to express the passage of time. In these cases Finnish has a subjectless clause.

(96) It's *getting late/dark.*
On myöhä/on tulossa pimeä.
*Is late/Is becoming dark.

CONCLUSION

Above the SVC sentences have been dealt with on the basis of equivalence, i.e. as optimal translations of each other. When defining equivalence, Marton (1968:54-55) and Krzeszowski (1971:38) say that equivalent sentences which are formally similar are called congruent. Congruent sentences consist of the same number of equivalent formatives arranged in the same order. Marton and Krzeszowski disregard the English article. An application of this definition to English and Finnish SVC sentences reveals a certain amount of congruence on the sentence level. The congruent sentence types are those that have *be* 'olla' + NP subject complement in the singular or in the plural and those with *be* 'olla' + adjectival subject complement in the singular (97, 98).

(97) Mary/is/a nurse.
Mary/on/sairaanhoitaja.

(98) The girl/is/beautiful.
Tyttö /on/kaunis.

The other copulas in Finnish require a particular case for the subject complement and thus the sentences are not formally similar and not congruent with the English sentences. This is also the case with *be* 'olla' + NP in the plural or adjectival complement in the plural (99 - 102).

(99) They/are/angels.
He /ovat/enkeleitä.

(100) Those men are very *rich.*
Nuo miehet ovat hyvin *rikkaita.*

(101) He became a doctor.
Hänestä tuli lääkäri.

(102) You look/sound *worried.*
Sinä näytät/kuulostat *huolestuneelta.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bald, W.-D. 1972. *Studien zu den kopulativen Verben des Englischen.* München: Max Hueber.

Bald, W.-D. 1973. A Contrastive Analysis of Linking-verbs in English and German, *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics* I, ed. J. Fisiak, Poznań, 47-63.

Christophersen, P., and A.O. Sandved. 1969. *An Advanced English Grammar.* London: Macmillan.

Hakulinen, A. 1975. Sanajärjestyksen eri tehtävistä, *Virittäjä*, 85-91.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1968. Notes on theme and transitivity in English, *Journal of Linguistics* 4, 179-215.

Ikola, O. 1973. *Subjekti vai predikatiivi? Eräs lauseenjäsennyksen umpikuja*, Suomalais-ugrilaisen seuran toimituksia 150.

Jespersen, O. 1954. *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles* II-III. London: Allen & Unwin.

Koski, M. 1969. Substantiiviseen nominatiivipredikatiiviin liittyvä lauseenjäsennysprobleemi, *Juhlakirja Paavo Siron täyttäessä 60 vuotta 2.8.1969*, Acta Universitatis Tamperensis A:26, Tampere, 90-101.

Krzeszowski, T. 1971. Equivalence, congruence, and deep structure, *Papers in Contrastive Linguistics*, ed. G. Nickel. Cambridge: University Press.

Marton, W. 1968. Equivalence and congruence in transformational contrastive studies, *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 1, ed. J. Fisiak, Poznań, 53-62.

Numminen, P. 1959. Eräistä lauseenjäsennyksen seikoista, *Sananjalka* 1, Turku, 19-38.

Poutsma, H. 1928. *A Grammar of Late Modern English*, I: *The Sentence*, First half: *the Elements of the Sentence*. 2nd edition. Groningen: P. Noordhoff.

Penttilä, A. 1963. *Suomen kielioppi*. Porvoo: WSOY.

Quirk, R. and S. Greenbaum. 1973. *A University Grammar of English*. London: Longman.

Quirk, R. and S. Greenbaum and G. Leech and J. Svartvik. 1972. *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London: Longman.

Setälä, E.N. and K. Nieminen and A. Ojajärvi. 1972. *Suomen kielen oppikirja*. Keuruu: Otava.

Setälä, E.N. 1973. *Suomen kielen lauseoppi*. 16th printing. Keuruu: Otava.

Siro, P. 1964. *Suomen kielen lauseoppi*. Helsinki: Tietosanakirja Oy.